

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uppto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/705,575	11/03/2000	Ernest L. Lawton	1596C9	6944
7590 01/06/2004			EXAMINER	
MARK D. SWEET, ESQUIRE			GRAY, JILL M	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARET & DUNNER, LLP 1300 I STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3315		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1774		

DATE MAILED: 01/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/705,575	LAWTON ET AL.			
Tarreery rioden	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Jill M. Gray	1774			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 01 December 2003 FAILS TO PLAI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: ('condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applicable at the same of the	cation. A proper reply to a			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of	f the final rejection.				
 The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later th ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). 	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the	fee. The appropriate extension fee under			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI	s Brief must be filed within the p R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o	period set forth in of the appeal.			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying th issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of f	ïnally rejected claims.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been cons <u>e Continuation Sheet</u>	idered but does NOT place the			
5. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.					
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					

Seatest and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

10. Other: ____

Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. The drawing correction filed on ____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the teachings of Pollet necessarily embraces those metallic fillers that have a hardness that exceeds the hardness of the glass fibers, also, it would have been obvious to modify the teachings of Pollet by including boron nitride particles to result in abrasive fibers.